



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,853	12/11/2006	Shin-ichi Kuroda	288624US2PCT	4199
22850 7590 07/12/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
CHAN, KAWING				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2837				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/12/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/573,853

Applicant(s)

KURODA, SHIN-ICHI

Examiner

Kawing Chan

Art Unit

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/15/10 has been entered.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. On pages 5-6 of Applicant's arguments, applicant argues that Hamachi fails to disclose the amended limitation in claim 1 because "according to Hamachi, since there is only one camera installed in the elevator car, there is only one image displayed of each elevator on the supervisory monitor 7b...it is respectfully submitted that in the device of Hamachi, when a malfunction occurs in an elevator, it is impossible to immediately search for the cause and location of the malfunction because only one image of each elevator is displayed on the supervisory monitor 7b" and "the display of two or more images simultaneously in Hamachi corresponds to two or more elevators, not two or more points along an escalator, as recited in claim 1."

In response to the arguments, although Hamachi fails to disclose the plurality of monitoring points are along an escalator, it provides the teachings of displaying different images of different cameras on the same display device simultaneously. As explained in the rejections below, Ponsot discloses a plurality of monitoring cameras separately installed at a plurality of monitoring points along at least one escalator (Figure 1: 5-9). While Ponsot discloses the use of plurality of cameras to monitor different locations along an escalator, and Hamachi provides the teachings of displaying different images of different cameras at the same time on a display device, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Ponsot with the teachings of Hamachi to achieved the claimed invention with no change in their respective functions. All the claimed limitations were known in the prior art and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ponsot et al. (US 6,606,538 B2) in view of Hamachi (JP 2004-189358 A) and Spitz et al. (US 2005/0099288 A1).

In Re claim 1, Ponsot discloses an elevating machine image supervisory system (Abstract) comprising:

- A plurality of monitoring cameras (5-9) separately installed at a plurality of monitoring points (5-9) along at least one escalator (1), the plurality of cameras outputting pieces of image data obtained by taking pictures of conditions of said plurality of monitoring points (Col 3 lines 43-56 and Col 4 lines 9-16);
- Wherein said monitoring points include an entrance of the escalator, an exit of the escalator, or a location between said entrance and said exit (5-9).

Ponsot fails to disclose an image data accumulation device, an accumulated image data display device, and the monitoring request contains reproduction start date information.

However, Hamachi discloses an elevating machine image supervisory system (Abstract) comprising:

- An image data accumulation device that accumulates individual pieces of image data output from said plurality of monitoring cameras in a time series manner (Paragraphs [0030-0036]); And

- An accumulated image data display device that displays image data accumulated in said image data accumulation device in response to a monitoring request (search parameter) from a user (Paragraphs [0032, 0035, 0037]);
- said image data accumulation device outputs a plurality of pieces of monitoring image data corresponding to said monitoring request to said accumulated image data display device when said monitoring request is generated (Paragraphs [0032, 0035, 0037]);
- said accumulated image data display device discriminates among said plurality of monitoring points (Paragraph [0030]: display control means displays images obtained by every surveillance camera in each elevator basket) installed at the elevator in response to the monitoring request (Paragraph [0037]: search parameter) which includes the elevator to be supervised and one piece of information regarding reproduction start time (i.e. search parameter—the occurrence time at the time of being the time at a certain time of the past), and
- Said accumulated image data display device displays, in response to the elevator to be supervised and said one piece of information regarding reproduction time included in said monitoring request (Paragraph [0037]), said plurality of pieces of monitoring image data corresponding to said plurality of monitoring points at said time while synchronizing said plurality of pieces of monitoring image data with each other (while image from

different cameras are displayed on the same screen at the same time based on the search parameter, the image data are displayed in synch with each other) (Paragraphs [0037, 0048-0051]).

Although Hamachi fail to disclose the image supervising system is used along with an escalator, it provides the teachings of capturing different images from different cameras and displaying the captured images on a display device simultaneously.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Ponsot (i.e. image supervising system having a plurality of cameras) with the teachings of Hamachi (i.e. image supervising system having a plurality of cameras), since it is known in the art to utilize image data display device to display images captured by the cameras so as to be able to monitor the condition of the elevator easily.

Ponsot and Hamachi in combination fail to disclose the monitoring request contains reproduction start date information.

However, Spitz discloses the request contains reproduction start date information (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Ponsot and Hamachi (i.e. monitoring request data) with the teachings of Spitz (i.e. monitoring request data), since it is known in the art to utilize reproduction start date information to request image data from the storage device so that user can monitor image at specific date and time as desired.

In Re claim 2, Hamachi discloses the plurality of monitoring points include the interior of an elevator car (surveillance camera 9 is installed in each of the elevators) (Paragraphs [0030, 0032]).

In Re claim 4, as we have discussed above, Hamachi discloses said accumulated image data display device discriminates among said plurality of monitoring points (Paragraph [0030]: display control means displays images obtained by every surveillance camera in each elevator basket) installed at the elevator in response to the monitoring request (Paragraph [0037]: search parameter) which includes the elevator to be supervised and one piece of information regarding reproduction start time (i.e. search parameter—the occurrence time at the time of being the time at a certain time of the past), and Spitz discloses the monitoring request includes information regarding start date (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]).

Although Ponsot, Hamachi and Spitz in combination fail to disclose the plurality of monitoring points include an entrance of a moving walk, an exit of the moving walk, or a location between said entrance and said exit, the examiner is taking Office Notices that it is well-known to utilize cameras to monitor the entrance, the exit or a location between the entrance and the exit of a moving walk.

In Re claim 5, Hamachi discloses said accumulated image data display device includes an operating condition supervisory screen (7a, 7b) that monitors the operating condition of an elevator, and said monitoring points are set on said operating condition supervisory screen (images captured by cameras installed in basket of each elevator are displayed on the screen based upon request) (Paragraphs [0048-0051]). In

addition, Spitz discloses the monitoring points are set on said operating condition supervisory screen (Figures 18-19; Paragraphs [0094-0097]).

In Re claim 6, Spitz discloses said monitoring request contains refresh rate information (68, 69), and said accumulated image data display device displays said image data based on said refresh rate information (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]).

In Re claim 7, Spitz discloses said display device stops the displaying at a time designated by monitoring request (i.e. user request) (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wiesinger et al., Suzuki ('757) and Suzuki ('230) are further cited to show related teachings in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kawing Chan whose telephone number is (571)270-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Benson can be reached on 571-272-2227. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2837

/Walter Benson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2837